

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 9 is amended.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Haneda et al. (Haneda), U.S. Patent No. 4,996,634 in view of Suzuki, U.S. Patent No. 4,809,144. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Haneda and Suzuki fail to disclose or suggest a combination of a car bumper and light unit, the light unit having as component elements both a housing suitable for containing at least one light source and a glass enabling light emitted by the light source to be diffused, wherein the outside skin of the car bumper includes an arrangement forming at least a portion of at least one of the component elements of the light unit, as recited in claim 1 and as similarly recited in claim 10.

The combinations recited in claims 1 and 10 are thus advantageous in that they can reduce the volume occupied by the rigid portions of the light unit, so that any deformation of the car bumper surrounding the light unit can take place without the rigid portions of the light unit being harmed (specification, page 2, lines 18-24).

Haneda discloses a bumper shell 1 with a signal lamp 10 attached to the bumper shell 1 (col. 3, lines 18 and 19). When the vehicle is involved in a collision, the bumper shell 1 deforms and the signal lamp 10 moves in a direction of the center of the vehicle so as to slide within the flanges 15, 16 when the shock absorber 2 is compressed (col. 3, lines 29-40).

As admitted on page 2 of the Office Action, the signal lamp 10 of Haneda does not have a glass for enabling light emitted by a light source to be diffused. There is no teaching, motivation or suggestion in Haneda to provide the signal lamp 10 with glass or a lens because the objective of Haneda is to provide a signal lamp 10 that is integrated into the bumper shell 1 such that the signal lamp 10 is capable of moving at the time of a collision. The signal

lamp 10 of Haneda is thus as simple as possible, and thus one skilled in the art would not be motivated to attempt to add glass to Haneda's signal lamp 10.

Suzuki discloses a vehicle headlamp (Fig. 1) with a lens 2 that is attached to a vehicle (not shown). Suzuki fails to provide any disclosure with regard to compensating for deformations that can occur during a collision. Consequently, Suzuki fails to provide any disclosure with regard to using a lens 2 that can withstand deformations. As should be appreciated, lenses of a headlamp typically are fragile and thus will not withstand deformations.


As a result, it would not have been obvious to adapt the headlamp of Suzuki into the bumper shell 1 of Haneda, because Suzuki fails to disclose a lens or glass that can resist the deformations anticipated by Haneda.

In view of the foregoing, Haneda and Suzuki fail to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in claims 1 and 10 as well as the additional features recited in the dependent claims. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-10 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



William P. Berridge  
Registration No. 30,024

Scott M. Schulte  
Registration No. 44,325

WPB:SMS/sxb

Attachment:  
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: February 10, 2005

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--